

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problems Mailbox.**

Remarks

Claims 1-26 are presently before the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 13-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chandra et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,389, herein after referred to as "Chandra"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 13-26 for the following reasons.

Chandra discloses a message queuing system integrated into a database system, where a queue is an ordered list of messages and the messages are requests for processing by an application. A queue table holds a set of queues, and each queue table is implemented as a database table within the relational database system. Each queue table can contain multiple queues each having multiple messages. Each row of a queue table represents a message in a queue of the queue table. Some of the columns in a queue table are meta-data describing the queue. (Col. 7, Lines 4-12 and Fig. 2) Chandra teaches that each application has a different view of the same queue, in order that a message can be dequeued and deleted from an application's view while the same message remains in the queue view of another application. (Col. 12, Lines 11-16) Thus, in Chandra, multiple views, or copies, of the same queue are maintained, in order that more than one application can access the same message. Chandra further teaches that when a message is dequeued by an application, a reference count of the message stored in the queue table is decremented, and that when the reference count reaches zero, the message is then either deleted or archived (Col. 20, Lines 40-49).

In claim 13 of the present application, the recited "system for delivery of information to multiple consumers" comprises "an information queue comprising one or more information

identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification” as recited in claim 21.

In an Enqueue Options parameter, there are no history records each comprising a message identification; in Chandra, the Enqueue Options parameter has one single correlation identifier. In an Enqueue Options parameter, there are no history records each comprising a consumer identification; in Chandra the Enqueue Options parameter comprises a recipient list, which is not the same as a set of history records each comprising a consumer identification. In an Enqueue Options parameter, there are no history records each comprising a message state identification; in Chandra the Enqueue Options parameter has one single state parameter. Moreover, while Chandra does disclose maintaining a message even after it is dequeued, in order to maintain a history of what has been done (Col. 19, Lines 28-30), retaining a message to maintain a history of what has been done does not disclose, teach or suggest a “history table comprising one or more history records, each of said one or more history records comprising a message identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification,” as recited in claim 21. Thus, claim 21 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Chandra.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21, and thus, for the same reasons discussed with regard to claim 21, claim 22 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Chandra.

Claim 23 recites a “method for multiple consumers to access information in a non first-in first-out, prescribed order, said information comprising one or more pieces of information, a first piece of information stored in a first location,” the method comprising “providing access to said first piece of information to a first consumer of said multiple

consumers; indicating in a second location that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information; providing access to said first piece of information to a second consumer of said multiple consumers; and indicating in a third location that said consumer has accessed said first piece of information". As previously discussed, in Chandra, when a message is dequeued, or otherwise accessed, by an application, a reference count of the message in the queue table is decremented. (Col. 20, Lines 40-49) Thus, in Chandra, when a first message is accessed by a first consumer (or first application) and then by a second consumer (or second application), the same reference count is decremented. Thus, Chandra, does not disclose, teach or suggest a method comprising "indicating in a second location that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information" and "indicating in a third location that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information". In discussing claim 23, the Office Action cites Col. 30, Line 30 to Col. 32, Line 60 of Chandra. Applicants respectfully point out that this portion of Chandra is concerned with creating the queue table in the relational database, and is not concerned with consumers, or applications, accessing information. For these reasons, Chandra does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 23.

Claims 24-26 depend from claim 23, and thus, for the same reasons discussed with regard to claim 23, claims 24-26 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Chandra.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-12 of the present application have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,502, herein after referred to as

"Capps"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-12 for the following reasons.

Capps teaches a data input technique for a computer that provides a user with a historical list of potential choices for the data input. (Col. 2, Lines 17-19) In Capps, a historical list is displayed to the user so that the user can input data by selecting an item from the historical list being displayed. (Col. 2, Lines 20-23) In Capps, the historical list of the most recently and/or frequently used data values for the data field that the user is entering data for are provided to the user. (Col. 2, Lines 31-33)

Claim 1 of the present application recites a "method for managing information to be accessed by multiple consumers, said information comprising one or more information records, said information records to be accessed by said multiple consumers in a specified order, each said information record comprising data to be accessed by a consumer". Capps fails to disclose, teach or suggest the method recited in claim 1 of the present application. In Capps, the history list does not have "information records to be accessed by said multiple consumers in a specified order". In Capps, any user can access any of the data in a history list in any order. In Capps, the history list is simply a list of items, any one of which a user can access when they are inputting data to a data field related to the respective history list. Thus, Capps does not disclose, teach or suggest the method of claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites "updating a history table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said history record comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer

to indicate said consumer accessed said data". The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Capps does not disclose or teach a "message state field".

Moreover, a message state field is not suggested by, or obvious in light of, Capps. In Capps, a history table is maintained from which a history list is produced. (Col. 11, Lines 14-15) A history table in Capps contains a string/pointer to the data of a respective history list, the last time the corresponding data item was accessed by a user of the history list, and the overall number of times that users have accessed the corresponding data in the history list. (Col. 11, Lines 21-30 and Fig. 6A)

Capps does not disclose, teach or suggest updating a history table comprising one or more history records where the updating comprises setting a message state field in a history record corresponding to a consumer to indicate the consumer accessed the data. Capps is not concerned with keeping track of which consumer accessed what data; all Capps is concerned with is how many times anyone accessed a particular data item. Thus, Capps does not disclose, teach or suggest a "a message state field" or "updating a history table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said history record comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data," as recited in claim 1. Capps, therefore, does not disclose, teach or suggest the method recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and thus, for the same reasons discussed with regard to claim 1, claims 2-12 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Capps.


Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

LYON & LYON LLP
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: October 24, 2001


Paul P. McKernan
Reg. No. 41,986

633 West Fifth Street, 47th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071-2066
(408) 993-1555